UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEPHEN L. JOHNSON, JUDGE

In Re:

AUTO CARE MALL OF FREMONT, INC.,

Debtor.

Debtor.

) Case No. 12-56050
) Chapter 11
)

Thursday, January 3, 2013
) San Jose, California

Hearing on:

- a) Motion for relief from stay, by Bank of Marin [45];
- b) Opposition by debtor;
- c) Motion to convert case to Chapter 7, by the Office of the U.S. Trustee [48];
- d) Response by Bank of Marin;
- e) Hearing re approval of the disclosure statement, by debtor [41];
- f) Objection by the U.S. Trustee;
- g) Objection by Bank of America;
- h) Objection by Bank of Marin; and
- i) Status conference [6], continued from December 17, 2012.

Appearances:

For the Debtor: Patrick Calhoun, Esq.

For Daniel Duke: Patrick Costello, Esq.

For Bank of Marin: Neil J. Rubenstein, Esq.

Craig Chiang, Esq.

From the Office of the

U.S. Trustee: John S. Wesolowski, Attorney Advisor

For Bank of America: Regis A. Guerin, Esq. (via telephone)

Digital Court United States Bankruptcy Court

Recorder: Clerk of the Court

280 South First Street, Room 3035

San Jose, California 95113

Certified Electronic

Transcriber: Palmer Reporting Services

Proceedings recorded by digital recording; transcript produced by federally-approved transcription service.

Motions Hearing 2. 1 Thursday, January 3, 2013 3:05 o'clock p.m. 2 PROCEEDINGS THE CLERK: Court is now in session. 3 4 THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon, everybody. 5 [COUNSEL]: Good afternoon. 6 THE COURT: Happy New Year. 7 THE CLERK: This is the Court's 3:00 p.m. calendar, in 8 the case of Auto Care Mall of Fremont, Inc. Could we have 9 appearances, please? 10 MR. CALHOUN: Patrick Calhoun for the debtor. 11 THE COURT: Okay. 12 MR. COSTELLO: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Patrick 13 Costello for Daniel Duke. 14 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Neil 15 Rubenstein and Craig Chiang for Bank of Marin. 16 MR. WESOLOWSKI: And John Wesolowski for the U.S. 17 Trustee. MR. GUERIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Regis Guerin 18 19 for secured creditor Bank of America. 20 THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon to everybody. 21 Please be seated. Sorry. 22 All right. So this is - this is a motion -23 effectively it's a motion for relief for stay that was brought 2.4 by Bank of Marin, who has installed a receiver at the property, 25 who the Court has left in place during the pendency of the

1 | bankruptcy case.

asset real estate case, the debtor was obliged to file, I suppose, a response to the motion for relief from stay or under 362(d)(3), wisely filed a plan and disclosure statement within 90 days. I don't think that there's any argument that the other prong of that test, which is making payments, applies here. So what we're really dealing with is whether the debtor has a plan that can be confirmed, has a reasonable possibility of being confirmed in a reasonable amount of time.

Is that right?

MR. CALHOUN: Well, yes, Your Honor, except that we basically have gone way past that and I believe we have a global settlement.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. COSTELLO: With I think pieces broken - pieces trying to break out in the last several days, which -

THE COURT: Okay. This would be a good time to inject piece because I'm about to -

(Laughter.)

THE COURT: - I'm about to tell you what I think of this whole thing. In fact, -

MR. COSTELLO: And, well, then perhaps -

THE COURT: You can't see it, but I could read this to you right now. So what would like to tell me about resolving

1 | the matter?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

2 MR. CALHOUN: Basically, -

MR. COSTELLO: Well, Your Honor, - yeah, I think Mr.

Calhoun will present it, but there are arrangements with both

Bank of America and Bank of -

THE COURT: Bank of Marin too?

MR. COSTELLO: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. All right.

MR. CALHOUN: And — and with Mr. Duke and Flipper Marine, the judgments that they have there, which is the cross-collateralized Bank of America loan that we have on the debtor's —

THE COURT: That's the deed of trust that Bank of America has.

MR. CALHOUN: Correct.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. CALHOUN: So as of, I believe, yesterday or the day before, we did receive written confirmation that BofA, Mr. Duke, Flipper Marine, and the debtor would have come to a settlement on the Bank of America obligation. For the payment of \$700,000, they will release their deed of trust. I will let Mr. Costello speak further, if he wants to, or if the Court wants to hear more about the global aspects of the settlement, but basically that \$6 million judgment is going to be taken care of with this \$700,000 payment. What it does to this case is it

eliminates the deed of trust against the property so that we will be clean of that debt and the adversary proceeding that's pending there.

In addition to that, the debtor has arranged pursuant to its draft of a new disclosure statement, whereby we indicated we were going to pay everybody 100 cents on the dollar, we are — have rec— and immediately we have received commitments in writing that, subject to the Bank of America settlement, that we have raised the money necessary to fully reinstate the Bank of Marin loan, pay all arrearages and taxes, and everybody will be paid 100 cents on the dollar.

THE COURT: Are you proposing to pay them in full, like pay them off?

MR. CALHOUN: Yes - no.

2.4

MR. COSTELLO: No. Reinstate.

MR. CALHOUN: Reinstate.

THE COURT: Reinstate, okay. And — all right. And then are you paying the amount that they're claiming or are you reserving the right to object?

MR. CALHOUN: Only reserving the right to object in state court as to the receiver's numbers and fees. We have seen them. We don't think we have any problems with them. Neither Mr. Duke nor the debtor feels they have any problems with them or that there will be any contest with those numbers. But we — those numbers — the ability to contest that in state court is

being reserved.

THE COURT: Okay. And that seems consistent with what you had filed before. And then the resolution of this case?

you had filed before. And then the resolution of this case?

MR. CALHOUN: Whatever the Court's desire. We talked with Mr. — the trustee this afternoon briefly. He feels that the matter, once it's paid off, it's going to be very short order, but once it's paid off, that we just basically dismiss, which is fine with us. If the Court would rather have us complete a plan, but there would be nobody to vote left, so I don't know what's going out happen, would happen in that vein either. But if the Court wants to keep its finger on it — the Court would always have its finger on it until their — the Bank of Marin signs off and they've been paid. But whether for the sake of costs of administration and so forth, the Court wants to continue it, they can, or we can just dismiss it.

THE COURT: And the Bank of Ame- - sorry. The Bank of Marin note will remain on the property, the promissory note, and the deed of trust will remain on the property, it will just be paid consistent with the terms of the existing arrangement?

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah. I think we have an agreement in substance, but I don't think it's procedurally the way it's set forth.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: And I don't think we have an agreement, because actually I did a written term sheet which I

Motions Hearing 7 1 think they're agreed with. Maybe I can just kind of tell the 2 Court what we understand it to be. And, again, I don't think there's susbstantively different disagreement, -3 4 THE COURT: Okay. MR. RUBENSTEIN: - but I -5 MR. COSTELLO: Well, yeah, that's subject to Mr. 6 7 Calhoun. I wouldn't have any objection if you have another copy 8 of this term sheet, presenting it to the Judge so the Judge 9 has -10 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Actually that was -11 MR. CALHOUN: I'll bring up mine. 12 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Okav. 13 MR. CALHOUN: So that's fine. 14 THE COURT: We can actually make a copy. 15 Tanya, could you just make -16 THE CLERK: Sure. 17 MR. [SPEAKER]: Your Honor, could I get a copy too, 18 please? 19 THE COURT: Yeah. 20 Just - I guess make two. Thank you. 21 Okay. So we'll have the term sheet and we'll look at 22 that. 23 Mr. Rubenstein, you started to talk about you think 2.4 you have the terms of a deal but not the procedure of a deal? 25 MR. RUBENSTEIN: The - the procedure's in the No.

1 term sheet.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: I'm saying I think the procedure's a little different than what Mr. Calhoun just said.

THE COURT: Okay. Why don't you tell me what you think is going to happen from this point forward.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. This - I'm reading from the term sheet that you're going to get in a second -

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: That's probably fine. Go ahead.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Point one, Bank of Marin is granted relief from the automatic stay as requested in the motion, that the order granting it will be granted today at this hearing.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. That's fine.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: And that is to exercise any and all of its rights and remedies under its loan documents and applicable law in connection with the real property and improvements, commonly known as 40851 to 40967 Albrae Street, Fremont, California, and all leases, grants, revenues, income, issues, and profits derived from the property. While the Court is entering the order and granting the motion today, relief is effective January 31st, 2013.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: The 14-day stay of the order otherwise provided in Bankruptcy Code Rule 4001(a)(3) is waived.

2.4

In connection with the Bank of America settlement, and we'll talk about this a little bit later, is they're going to be asking the Court for an order shortening time to get Court approval of the BofA settlement. And if the Court will not grant a hearing date to consider approval of debtor's settlement agreement with Bank of America on or before January 18th, 2013, the effective date of relief from the automatic stay will be February 15th, 2013, rather than January 31st.

MR. COSTELLO: Maybe we can just slightly depart from the term sheet and explain that a little bit right now, Your Honor. And the BofA settlement is a payment in full for \$700,000. Now that is not coming from estate funds. It's not estate funds. However, Bank of Marin — Bank of America believes it would be appropriate for the debtor to sign the settlement agreement. And I suspect we have the terms — you know, agreement in principle, but we haven't seen the agreement — I suspect there may even be a release in there, which would require Bankruptcy Court approval.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. COSTELLO: But — and we're looking — we're on a tight — on a short leash with Bank of Marin to get this whole thing done by the 31st. That's why we're targeting the 18th, because BofA has to be in place before we can do the

reinstatement.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. COSTELLO: And so we're looking for shortened time on that. I think certainly Mr. Duke's position is, is that it's appropriate — it would be appropriate to grant the order shortening time given that the settlement is essentially using — involves the payoff of Bank of America from nonestate funds. The only reason to have Bankruptcy Court approval is because the debtor is, in fact, signing off on the settlement agreement.

THE COURT: Well, and the debtor listed the claim, that it had a claim against Bank of America that was very substantial. If I recall, Exhibit B has like a \$5 million claim against Bank of America, right?

MR. CALHOUN: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I think that under Rule 9013 I can make — I can shorten time on oral motion if it's made in the middle of a hearing, and here we are. So I think we can, before we terminate this hearing, we can pick times and dates for hearings on an order shortening time. And the parties who are affected by that motion are present and can stipulate to whatever we agree to.

MR. CALHOUN: And I think -

THE COURT: All right. So that I think we can deal

24 with.

Okay. So then point number two, moving onto your

settlement agreement. So, Mr. Rubenstein, did you want to address point number two?

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Sure. Okay. During the period before the termination of the automatic stay, under point one, the debtor or Daniel Duke or some combination of them, with his own funds, will have the opportunity to reinstate the Bank of Marin loan secured by the deeds of trust on the property in accordance with nonbankruptcy law.

THE COURT: Okay.

2.4

MR. RUBENSTEIN: As you may recall, there are two notes and two deeds of trust.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. The third item is simply put in at the request of the debtor because they're concerned they might be blindsided with something. It doesn't really add anything substantive, but it's just kind of a comfort provision that they asked me to read on the record, which I'm doing.

Based on information currently available to Bank of Marin, there are no existing nonmonetary defaults on which it would rely in seeking to foreclose on its deeds of trust on the real property. It's conceivable that there exists some nonmonetary default, of which Bank of Marin is not currently aware that would justify Bank of Marin taking some enforcement action. Bank of Marin is not waiving its right to take such action.

1 THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. And four is the provision about the settlement between the debtor and Daniel Duke relating to Bank of America, which has already been discussed with you.

THE COURT: And all you're really doing is reciting that there is expected to be a settlement, \$700,000, for release of the lien filed against the debtor's property?

MR. COSTELLO: Just to clarify, Your Honor, that is it's more than just a release, it's a payoff of BofA in total.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: And also they asked us to state, which is — we had no problem with, that Bank of Marin has no objection to such a settlement between the debtor and Bank of America, and has no objection to the Court issuing an order shortening time to consider that.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: This is obviously based on the understanding that the \$700,000 is coming from funds other than funds of the estate.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Item five, the Bankruptcy Court has previously issued an order excusing the receiver from compliance with Bankruptcy Code sections 543(a) and 543(b)(1), which was subsequently amended by an order entered on December 28th. The order as amended states that it will remain effective through

and including January 31st, 2013, except that any party-ininterest may request a further extension of the deadline.

As you will recall, that was the order about the — excusing the receiver from having to turn over the property in her possession. The parties have agreed that the existing January 31, 2013 deadline in that order would be extended to February 28th, 2013, with the other provisions of the Bankruptcy Court order to remain unchanged.

THE COURT: Okay.

2.4

MR. RUBENSTEIN: And obviously the Court would have to do that, but that's what the parties would be requesting.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: And this settlement is conditioned on the Court actually issuing such an order.

Item six, if the Bank of Marin loans are reinstated in accordance with nonbankruptcy law, Bank of Marin agrees that it would promptly thereafter inform the receiver that the debtor has cured the defaults under the existing loan documents, and requests the receiver to act in accordance with paragraph 32 of the receivership order entered in the state court action. That provision provides that for the receiver to immediately turn over possession of the real property to the debtor upon the occurrence of various events, one of which is being notified by Bank of Marin that the loan has been cured. It does not provide for the receiver to turn over possession of the funds. That's —

- 1 | that's handled by another provision of the receivership order.
- 2 | But as far as this is talking about turning over the real
- 3 | property to the debtor upon the loan being reinstated.
- 4 THE COURT: So the debtor becomes starts running the
- 5 property again?
- 6 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Yes.
- 7 MR. COSTELLO: Correct.
- 8 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Right.
- 9 THE COURT: All right.
- 10 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Number seven is if the Bank of Marin
- 11 loans are reinstated in accordance with nonbankruptcy law, Bank
- 12 of Marin would support a request by the debtor to dismiss the
- 13 bankruptcy case.
- There was one more item, which is not here, that we
- 15 have also, I think, have an agreement on.
- 16 THE COURT: The copy that I have has Mr. Chiang's
- 17 interlineations.
- 18 MR. CHIANG: Then that's the issue that Mr. Rubenstein
- 19 | was about to bring up -
- 20 THE COURT: Superior court.
- 21 MR. RUBENSTEIN: About this -
- 22 MR. CHIANG: This is first.
- MR. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah. That's something we talked
- 24 about after I wrote this up.
- THE COURT: Okay.

1 MR. RUBENSTEIN: If the parties will seek state court 2 approval to authorize release of an agreed-upon portion of the funds the receiver is holding, which will be paid to Bank of 3 4 Marin and applied to the indebtedness owed by the debtor to Bank 5 of Marin. The receiver is holding, I believe, approximately 6 \$200,000. Some portion of that, she needs to – you know, there 7 will be additional expenses and things of that nature, but she 8 doesn't need to be holding \$200,000. 9 So the idea is that we will ask the superior court to 10 release some agreed-upon portion. Obviously the receiver has to 11 buy off on what the agreed-upon portion is to be paid to Bank of Marin, which would have the effect of reducing the additional 12 13 payment that has to be made - paid to Bank of Marin to reinstate 14 the loan. 15 THE COURT: So you're going to take some of the money 16 that the receiver has and apply it to that arrearage, basically 17 to the arrearage claim? 18 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Yes. 19 THE COURT: Yes. 20 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Yes, to the amount that is - yeah, 21 the arrearages, the amount that's -22 MR. COSTELLO: May not be necessary to reinstate -23 MR. RUBENSTEIN: - passed through. 2.4 THE COURT: Okay. 25 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah.

THE COURT: All right. So you're just getting -1 2 somehow you're going - and is the debtor or Mr. Duke's counsel 3 going to be involved in coming up with that number? 4 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Well, what we're going to do - as I 5 understand is they want the number to be as high as possible. 6 And so what really is going to turn out is we're going to talk 7 to the receiver about how much of a cushion she figures she 8 needs. 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 MR. RUBENSTEIN: And also there is likely that certain 11 amount are - of Bank of Marin's attorney's fees that will be 12 incurred in winding up the receivership case will be paid out of 13 that. So we've bandied about some numbers, but I don't have 14 something from the receiver -15 THE COURT: Okay. And is that - the resolution of 16 that is going to take place in the superior court, though? 17 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Right. THE COURT: That number, whatever -18 19 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Right. 20 THE COURT: - number or dispute that - Mr. Calhoun, 21 you said earlier you may have issues with respect to payment of 22 the receiver for costs the receiver incurred -23 MR. CALHOUN: I don't expect to have them, but that 24 was being reserved. And, just for the Court's information, the 25 trustee's fees have been paid -

1 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Receiver.

2.4

MR. CALHOUN: - receiver's - fees have been paid to the receiver as they've gone along, -

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CALHOUN: — collected the money. So that portion has been already paid. So when we're talking about \$200,000, that is trus—— receiver has been paid.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Well, but -

MR. CALHOUN: There will be some dangling money.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Obviously the state court has to approve the payment but, you know, she's — she's taken in her own payments, just like in a bankruptcy case, subject to court approval.

Now one of the — one of the things that will matter in her deciding how much the cushion is going to be is whether there is the potential of the debtor making a claim against her in the receivership case because in which case she would undoubtedly need to file — retain a lawyer. So although we are not making it a condition of the settlement that they say they're not going to make a claim against the receiver, they have already made a claim against the receiver. I mean they've sent some letters saying that they're going to be asserting a claim. And then my expectation is as long as that possibility exists, the receiver is going to want to hold sufficient funds

from the receivership estate to be able to deal with it and defend against it.

THE COURT: Okay.

2.4

MR. RUBENSTEIN: And so I mean - so that's one of the reasons we don't know what the number's going to be. Part of it -

THE COURT: Well, then some of it's in the debtor's and Mr. Duke's control.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Exactly.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. COSTELLO: And it's within — presumably that all gets resolved, there will be — presumably by next week there will be a stipulated motion or order in front of the state court to allow the receiver to release funds —

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah.

MR. COSTELLO: — and that presumably — that's where the issue of the claims against the receiver could be dealt with and resolved as well.

THE COURT: Right. That makes sense to me. Okay. So in terms of what we need to accomplish here today, the first thing it seems to me that we need to do is we need an order shortening — I need to grant an order shortening time and find a time to get the settlement between the debtor — I guess it's between the debtor and Mr. Duke and Bank of America on the

calendar, so — so that we can see if there are objections and whether that can be approved or not.

And we'd like to have that heard before — on or before January 18th; is that right?

MR. CALHOUN: That is what has been worked out between - pretty much between Mr. Duke with Mr. Costello's office and - and Bank of Marin. I'm - I'm not trying to make the Court jump over any barrels or anything like -

THE COURT: I just have to see if I have time to do it and -

MR. CALHOUN: I know. So I mean it's not important to me as whether it's the 18th or the 31st or the 10th.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$ COSTELLO: But it is important in terms of what - when the relief from stay is effective. That's -

MR. CALHOUN: Correct.

MR. COSTELLO: We have a -

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Well, the — the terms of the agreement are is they're asking the Court to have it heard on or before the 18th. And the only reason it won't be heard before or on the 18th is if it's not convenient to the Court.

THE COURT: Why don't we do it three o'clock on Wednesday, on the 17th.

THE CLERK: Okay.

THE COURT: So three o'clock on the 17th, which is a Thursday. Is that convenient for counsel? And you can appear

- 1 Court's shortened time, any objection should be raised at the 2 hearing.
- 3 MR. CALHOUN: Fine.
- THE COURT: And then it's the 17th at 3:00. All right. So that's point one.

Point two is this is really a resolution of the — the relief-from-stay motion that your client made, counsel. So I think under — I don't think we need separate notice of this whole business because I think under 4001(d)(4), we'll call it — we don't have to get — we don't have to have separately noticed out of hearing because this — the relief that you're seeking is less, in your stipulation is less than you might have been entitled to if you pressed the motion. So I say you just have to upload a stipulation that the parties have agreed to. And if it's consistent with what you've told me here today, I'll sign an order approving it.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Just — well, what I believe the order in the agreement is, is the Court is just granting the motion for relief from the automatic stay effective January 31st.

- THE COURT: Okay.
- 22 MR. RUBENSTEIN: And with a 14-day waiver of Rule
- 23 4001.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- 24 THE COURT: That's your point one.
- 25 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah. Yeah. I mean I don't I

1 don't think all this other stuff is from the relief-from-stay 2 order. 3 THE COURT: Okay. MR. COSTELLO: Agreed. I think it just - it should be 4 5 an approved form of order, but I think it's a very simple order that just grants relief from stay effective as of the 31st. 6 That's right, Your Honor. 7 MR. CHIANG: I can just upload or circulate an order granting - the proposed order 8 9 granting stay relief with -10 THE COURT: Okay. That's -MR. CHIANG: - the effective dates. 11 12 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Okav. 13 THE COURT: I think the fastest thing would be if you 14 just have counsel sign off, otherwise we hold them. But if you 15 have Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Costello sign off, then we'll move forward with it -16 17 MR. RUBENSTEIN: If we can - well, obviously we'll submit it to - generally, you'll be able to get to it promptly. 18 19 MR. [SPEAKER]: Yes, agreed. 20 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. 21 THE COURT: All right. So that takes care of the 22 motion for relief from stay and the order shortening time. Then 23 what remains I think is Mr. Wesolowski's motion to convert. 2.4 MR. RUBENSTEIN: There's another motion -25 THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: — as well. The Court had issued the order confirming — excuse me — the order excusing the receiver from compliance with Bankruptcy Code Section 543(a) and 543(b), which currently has by its terms ends on January 31st, 2013, unless further extended. Then that order should be — it's previously been amended once to go over — yeah, I think last week the Court signed that order —

THE COURT: Yeah.

2.4

MR. RUBENSTEIN: — going to January 31st, 2013. It should be amended a second time to go to February 28th, 2013, with everything else in the order remaining the same.

THE COURT: Any objection to that, gentlemen?

MR. COSTELLO: Mr. Duke — the rationale, Your Honor, is, is that if for some reason Mr. Duke and the debtor failed to perform, Bank of Marin doesn't want to be in a situation where come January 31st all of sudden the receiver is out of possession and the debtor is back in possession. So consistent with — with the terms of our arrangement, Mr. Duke has no objection to that.

THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Calhoun, you've previously not liked the idea of the receiver. Do you agree to a receiver at this point —

MR. CALHOUN: Well, I'm just a penny-pincher in the sense that I don't like the fees that accrue. I'd like some recognition that we may not be charged for fees for February if

it's a one-day or a two-day deal.

2.4

THE COURT: Well, I imagine the receiver is going to act in every way fairly. And so we'll — if necessary, I'll deal with that, but I think it's actually something that the superior court has to deal with, —

MR. CALHOUN: Yeah.

THE COURT: — the receiver being their creature, not mine.

MR. CHIANG: Then, Your Honor, would you like me to circulate another — a second order extending that date?

THE COURT: I think that makes sense because it keeps the — it keeps the case in the same status while the matter is resolved. And I think earlier I concluded it made sense to leave the receiver in place, which was a little unusual, but I think under the facts still the right thing to do. We'll just continue the receiver in place and that will be the order.

MR. WESOLOWSKI: And, Your Honor, the U.S. Trustee originally had an objection to the receiver, but under the circumstances I think what you're doing here is appropriate.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, thank you.

All right. So, Mr. Chiang, I guess two orders. One is the on the relief from stay and the second on the receiver.

And I think it would be helpful if you had opposing counsel sign off on both orders, so I know that the terms are consistent with what they think is happening.

1 MR. CHIANG: I'll do that, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Okay. And then, counsel, if you could, 3 you know, be responsive to Mr. Chiang's - I'm sure he'll fax 4 them to you or email them to you, get them back to him 5 immediately so we can get this thing resolved. 6 All right. Is there anything else that we need to 7 discuss? MR. WESOLOWSKI: Your Honor, we got the motion to 8 9 convert or dismiss. Maybe that should just be continued to some 10 future date. 11 THE COURT: Yeah, I think that makes the most sense. 12 Why don't we continue that. 13 Do we have a March - is it March 7th, Tanya? 14 THE CLERK: Yes. 15 THE COURT: Let's continue that to March - although, 16 actually, we should put that on a law and motion calendar at 17 that point because we won't need a status conference. 18 THE CLERK: Okay. 19 THE COURT: Although we do need to figure out where 20 this case is going. 21 (The Court and Clerk confer.) 22 MR. WESOLOWSKI: Your Honor, there's also a status 23 conference today as well. 24 THE COURT: So we'll continue the status conference 25 and the motion the convert or dismiss to March 7 at - is it at -

```
THE CLERK: 10:00 or 1:00 - 2:00.
 1
                         10:00, I think. 10:00 a.m.
 2
              THE COURT:
 3
              MR. WESOLOWSKI: And that would be the disclosure
 4
    statement hearing as well, which is sort of mute at this point,
 5
    it looks like.
              THE COURT: Right, right. It would be continued as
 6
7
    well, I suppose.
              So, Mr. Calhoun, just to be clear, we're not expecting
 8
9
    you to go forward with a disclosure statement given the
10
    settlement that you've announced, so - and if something goes
11
    wrong and you are pressing that, you'll need to give the
12
    Courtroom Deputy a call.
13
              MR. CALHOUN: Okay.
              THE COURT: A calendar we don't use for disclosure
14
15
    statements.
16
              MR. RUBENSTEIN: One clarification. On the - on the
17
    order granting relief from the automatic stay, I mean we're
18
    supposed to put in the order the Bankruptcy Code section that
19
    it's based on and our motion was based on 362(d)(1) and 362-
20
              THE COURT:
                           (3).
21
              MR. RUBENSTEIN: -362(d)(1) and 362(d)(3).
                                                            That -
22
    so -
23
              THE COURT: I actually think it's a stipulated order,
24
    so I think you just - it's a stipulated order, so I think what
25
    it is is what the parties have agreed to, not what I would have
```

	Motions Hearing 27
1	concluded. I would have told you what I was going to conclude,
2	but you didn't want to hear that.
3	MR. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Well, -
4	THE COURT: And I don't think you want to hear it
5	now
6	(Laughter.)
7	THE COURT: So I think you better just say the parties
8	have stipulated to this relief. It's a very good resolution, I
9	think.
LO	MR. RUBENSTEIN: Okay.
L1	THE COURT: I will say that. And so I think you just
L2	say the motion is granted -
L3	MR. RUBENSTEIN: Pursuant to. Perfect.
L4	MR. CHIANG: Have to say the motion is granted, Your
L5	Honor, under 362 -
L6	THE COURT: Yeah.
L7	MR. CHIANG: $-(3)$.
L8	THE COURT: 362(d).
L9	MR. RUBENSTEIN: Good enough, okay.
20	THE COURT: Right. Anything else? So we got the
21	trustee's motion -
22	MR. GUERIN: Your Honor, Regis Guerin for Bank of
23	America.
24	THE COURT: Yes.
25	MR. GUERIN: There is also a motion to dismiss the

Motions Hearing 29 THE CLERK: To the one after the 14th? 1 2 THE COURT: Yeah, -3 THE CLERK: February 4th. 4 THE COURT: No, a month. So to - whenever the next 5 one is. 6 THE CLERK: February 19th. 7 THE COURT: Okay. So February 19th, Mr. Guerin. 8 February 19th for your motion to dismiss, which -9 MR. GUERIN: Okay. 10 THE COURT: - you know if the parties have resolved 11 this matter - Mr. Calhoun, have you answered that complaint, -12 Mr. Guerin, no you filed a motion to dismiss. 13 MR. CALHOUN: Correct. 14 MR. GUERIN: Correct. 15 THE COURT: All right. You can stipulate to dismiss, 16 if that makes sense. Otherwise you can appear and we'll deal 17 with it at the time. MR. CALHOUN: And there is -18 19 MR. GUERIN: Right. 20 MR. CALHOUN: - one other little thing that was - it's somewhat important, I guess, is a BofA was going to represent 21 22 that they are in agreement with the settlement as recited today. 23 THE COURT: Is that true, Mr. Guerin? MR. GUERIN: Is that - that is correct, Your Honor. 2.4 25 THE COURT: Okay. Well, through have it, Mr. Calhoun.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Your Honor, just out of an abundance of caution, if anything can go wrong, it will, I can envision — I can envision the superior court order, you know if we go in and we ask the money to be released, it will say, 'Oh, gee whiz, this case is in bankruptcy,' so can we have a provision, and I think obviously it would be subject to everybody's buyoff, in the relief from stay order, basically, saying that relief from stay includes the right to have the superior court order — superior court release funds held by the receiver.

MR. CALHOUN: To your client?

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Yes.

MR. CALHOUN: I have no problem. I would — I would rather get that money into Bank of Marin's hands as opposed to being \$20\$ short come the 31st of January.

THE COURT: Okay. That in effect is just a payment on the secured debt, which wouldn't require a plan anyway. So I don't have a problem including that in the order at all.

MR. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Thanks.

One other comment, and this is — I apologize, it's kind of difficult to — it's more of a question of Mr. Guerin.

And I'm sorry pressing this in court, is I expect — because Bank of America is a party to the superior court action, I envision that what we're going to do is we're going to make an application to the superior court and be accompanied, ideally, by a stipulation to all parties to that case saying that they

- agree or they have no objection to what the request is, in an
 effort to try to avoid having the superior court put it on a

 28-day calendar, or something like that. Would Bank of America,
 obviously subject to the looking at the stipulation, make sure
 it's acceptable, is that something that Bank of America would be
 willing to do?
 - MR. GUERIN: Yeah. I don't think we have any any dogs in that fight, so to speak. I don't think we have any problems with it, so.
- 10 MR. RUBENSTEIN: Thank you.
- 11 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. GUERIN: You can send me the stipulation and we'll take a look and most likely sign off on it.
- MR. RUBENSTEIN: Thank you.
 - THE COURT: Okay. I think that's it. I think it's a very good resolution for the parties. I'm sure it was a lot of work getting here. And so I'll see whoever's here on the 17th for the hearing on the motion to approve the resolution with Bank of America. And, otherwise, I'll receive two orders from Mr. Chiang, which will be the relief-from-stay order and the receiver order.
- 22 Is that it?
- MR. RUBENSTEIN: Yes. Thank you very much, Your
- 24 Honor.

7

8

9

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25 THE COURT: Okay. And continued hearings on the

Yes.

2.4

25

as well?

THE CLERK:

	3
1	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Guerin, just to be clear,
2	there's a CMC in the adversary proceeding at the end of this
3	month which we're also going to move to the 19th of February.
4	So you're going to have your motion to dismiss and the case
5	management conference on the same day.
6	MR. GUERIN: Fantastic.
7	THE COURT: And so -
8	MR. GUERIN: I do anticipate that it will be dismissed
9	by then, anyway, but -
10	THE COURT: We'll - we'll -
11	MR. GUERIN: Thank you.
12	THE COURT: - eliminate the need to file a case
13	management conference statement too.
14	MR. CALHOUN: Yes. And in the event we can get this
15	done in writing and stipulated, then we can relieve the Court of
16	that date too. So I'll get that to as soon as we can.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	MR. GUERIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Thank you very much.
20	MR. RUBENSTEIN: Thank you.
21	THE COURT: All right. Good luck.
22	MR. CALHOUN: Thank you, Your Honor.
23	THE CLERK: That concludes the calendar. Please rise.
24	(The hearing was concluded at 3:41 o'clock p.m.)
25	-000-

State of California)
County of San Joaquin)

I, Susan Palmer, certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to the best of my ability, of the above pages, of the digital recording provided to me by the United States Bankruptcy Court, Northern District of California, of the proceedings taken on the date and time previously stated in the above matter.

I further certify I am not a party to nor in any way interested in the outcome of this matter.

I am a Certified Electronic Reporter and Transcriber through the American Association of Electronic Reporters and Transcribers, Certificate No. 00124. Palmer Reporting Services is approved by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to officially prepare transcripts for the U.S. District and Bankruptcy Courts.

Susan Palmer Palmer Reporting Services Dated March 5, 2013